

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,030	05/18/2006	Roland Steffen	01012-1035	3912
30671 DITTHA VON	7590 09/28/200 G MORI & STEINER,	EXAMINER		
918 Prince St.		AKINYEMI, AJIBOLA A		
Alexandria, V.	A 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2618	•
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/28/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/563,030	STEFFEN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
AJIBOLA AKINYEMI	2618	

	AJIBOLA AKINYEMI	2618	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 09 September 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE	
<ol> <li>Me reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following i application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date whave been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of a under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of thes set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>			
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b  (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (b) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in the place th	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or	ter form for appear by materially rec	rucing or simplifying ti	ie issues ioi
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment (I	PTOL -324)
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inpliant Americanient (i	102-324).
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	it canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1.3-12 and 14-19</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Duc Nguyen/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2618			

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant angued that None of the references cited discisces one or more high frequency module to include a local oscillator provided in the housing that is seperated from a housing of the measuring device unit. Examiner respectfully disagrees with this statement because Weiler already discloses a first high-frequency module (fig.4, liem 3A) including a transmitter device (col.6, lines 28-31) configured to communicate with the device under test (fig.4, liem 15), including a receiver device (col.6, lines 28-31) configured to communicate with the device under test (fig.4, liem 15), wherein each high-frequency module is placed spatially separated from the measuring-device unit (fig.4, liem 5). Weiler did not disclose a local oscillator with the high frequency module connected together provided in a housing that is separate from the housing of the measuring device unit but Wedge disclose a system which include a transceiver that share a local oscillator (fig.3, item 58). The measuring unit in this case is (fig.3, item 18) which is separate from the local oscillator.